

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-11 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the outstanding Office Action, page 2, item 3, the phrase "outputting dialogue content" is indicated as being indefinite. Applicants amended the claim language to clearly point out the subject matter to overcome this rejection. For example, amended claim 1 now recites "outputting the stored dialogue content that was stored at computers which have the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario." Support for this amendment is found in, for example, page 20, lines 6-13 of the specification of the present application.

Further, in order to make clear that the claims are not means-plus-function type claims (i.e., not subject to 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶6), Applicants replaced "means" with "unit" in claims 2-11.

In view of the amended claims, Applicants believe that all pending claims are definite and no further rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 is anticipated. If, however, the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned who will be happy to work with the Examiner in a joint effort to derive mutually acceptable language.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 3, items 5-11, of the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,766,319 to Might (hereinafter "Might"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 specifically recites, amongst other novel features, "**assigning correspondences between the dialogue scenarios and destination addresses**". (Emphasis Added). Claim 1 can be understood, for example, by referring to FIG. 2, and page 21, lines 5-19 of the specification of this present application. Independent claims 9 and 10 recite somewhat similar features.

Claim 1 specifically recites, amongst other novel features, "**assigning correspondences between the dialogue scenarios and destination addresses**". (Emphasis Added). Claim 1 can be understood, for example, by referring to FIG. 2, and page 21, lines 5-19 of the specification of this present application. Independent claims 9 and 10 recite somewhat similar

features.

In our Response filed on November 22, 2005, we argued the following:

- (a) Might does not disclose end computers capable of transferring information to more than one server.
- (b) Might fails to disclose anything comparable to the feature of "assigning correspondences between the dialogue scenarios and destination addresses".

In items 16 and 17 on page 6 of the current Office Action, in the "Response to Arguments" section, the Examiner responds to our arguments with the following arguments:

- (a) The Examiner argues that "multiple servers" are not recited in the claims. Moreover, the Examiner alludes to Might disclosing five separate databases as well as the system being used on any combination of networks.
- (b) The Examiner notes that Applicant is only claiming transmitting to "a" destination address.

In response to argument (a) rebuttal in the current Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the Might 's teachings are misstated. There is only one database in Might as clearly stated in col. 5, lines 20-21: "[the] system 100 comprises a database server 110, which includes a server 120 and a database 130." Further in col. 5, line 31, it is stated that "[the] database 130 includes five highly coupled databases. " To more clearly recite "multiple servers", in claim 1, 2, 9, and 10, "a destination address" is now replaced with "the destination addresses", thereby providing also a response relative to argument (b).

According to amended claim 1, the content from a dialogue scenario to be transmitted to a plurality of destination addresses. As Might does not disclose anything comparable to this feature, Might does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2, 9 and 10 also recite "transmitting the dialogue content to the destination addresses corresponding to the dialogue scenario" that is a feature undisclosed by Might, which feature renders the claims patentable. Claims 3-6 and 11 are not anticipated by Might at least because Might does not anticipated their respective base claim.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Might in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0032115 ("Goldstein"). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Goldstein does not teach or suggest the above-identified deficiency of Might related to transmitting the content from a dialogue scenario to a plurality of destination addresses. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 are patentable over Might in view of Goldstein, viewed individually or in combination.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: May 15, 2006

By: L. Todor

Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501